

COMMUNICATIONS.

WHAT OUR JOURNAL IS DOING. SOME TRUTH.

No man more fully realized the enormity of the task undertaken when the State Society decided to publish an ethical journal and endorsed the policy of truth telling established by the Publication Committee, than did the editor of this JOURNAL. He knew and he knows the rottenness pervading the business of exploiting the medical profession by many pharmaceutical manufacturers and manufacturers of nostrums. But it seemed as though a little truth, told unflinchingly, might do some good. For at least five years quiet, personal, effort had been made by others to induce the *Journal A. M. A.* to become decent, but without result; no one would speak out, and little could be done when all other medical journals in the land could point to the official organ of the physicians themselves as excuse for advertising absolutely rotten, vile and worthless stuff, nostrums, etc., ad nauseam. The editor expected to get plenty of abuse, and he has not been disappointed; some of it has approached pretty close to personal slander. Fortunately for him, every step taken, every matter of policy, every decision connected with the advertising question, has been gone over by the whole Publication Committee. That committee has had many meetings and nearly all of them have been attended by every member. So far as the financial side is concerned, every transaction has been carefully inspected by the auditing committee of the Trustees and they know just what is going on and just what is being done. It would therefore be an easy matter to protect the editor from slander at home; from the attacks of those abroad he does not care for protection, for he regards most of them as highly complimentary. All this is appropos of some letters recently received from some friends in various parts of the country. Two of these letters are of particular interest.

The first one stated that the men connected with the advertising department of the *Journal A. M. A.* were highly wroth with us for stirring up the advertising question, and that the manager of that department had been "knocking" our JOURNAL as hard as he could, impugning our motives and alleging personal reasons for our attitude. This, we must confess, we find it hard to believe; but it came pretty straight.

The second is of more general interest and therefore the editor bespeaks your careful reading of it. Some of it is decidedly too personal to quote, but most of it follows:

Dear Dr. Jones: In reply to your letter I would say that to repeat all the comments and criticisms would be too long a story; I will tell you more of them when I see you again. Some say the editorials are not dignified enough; that you should not discuss the advertising question; that you are being imposed upon (!); that your JOURNAL is operating for the benefit of a few good houses and the German chemical manufacturers. Other comments are too personal and abusive to be written. There are a number of concerns that would give almost anything to see your JOURNAL go to the wall. I learned of one house that was wildly indignant because, they said, the *Journal A. M. A.* had required them to give a formula on account of what you had published. It is certainly remarkable the commotion your little JOURNAL is making. You have arrayed against you the manufacturers of secret proprietary stuff, editors of personally or privately owned journals, advertising agencies and even some of the reputable houses. Nevertheless, it seems to me that they will have to come your way in time, especially if other state journals will adopt a similar policy. Of these, only three seem to be clean; Colorado, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. How medical societies will permit such atrocious advertisements as are appearing in the

Missouri and the *New York Association Journals*, I cannot understand; they are worse than the *Journal A. M. A.* ever was. I am very glad to say that you have a few very warm and enthusiastic friends in the business world, who decidedly approve the policy and course of your JOURNAL and appreciate the work your Society is doing. I learned through a common acquaintance that the O'Gorman Advertising Agency is clipping the articles in which you attack or mention unfavorably different houses, and sending the clippings to these concerns, trying to influence them against your JOURNAL. I learned, the other day, from one of your advertisers who is most enthusiastic in approval of the JOURNAL that a certain house in this city had offered to pay for his advertising in three other journals—any three he wanted—if he would withdraw his advertisement from yours. He assured me that he would not. If you can keep up the fight for another year and force the Trustees of the *A. M. A.* to adopt a policy of ethical decency in the conduct of the *Association Journal*, your fight, I think, will be won. Personally I wish you every possible success. Cordially yours, A. B.

"OAKLAND AND VACCINATION."

To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL:—Referring to your editorial, "Oakland and Vaccination," Vol. II, No. 11, p. 326, I beg to say that instead of Oakland, some one in San Francisco is slightly behind the times. Oakland has been enforcing the Compulsory Vaccination Law since June, 1904. A free vaccination day has been in vogue here still longer. No case of smallpox has occurred in Oakland since July 12th, 1904. As to the anti-vaccination societies, they have not been heard from for some time, and we believe they die from inanition if not irritated. The enclosed 'Bulletin' of the Health Department may be of value. You may receive it regularly if you desire, and possibly thereby avoid unfortunate errors regarding Oakland. Our health is excellent, and we want everybody to know it, so please insert, and oblige.

Cordially yours,

EDWARD VON ADELUNG,
Health Officer, Oakland, California.

(About the same time—almost in the same mail with the above letter—came a circular from a "Mrs. E. C. Campbell, Secretary," enclosing two leaflets entitled, respectively, "The Liberator," and "Legalized Child Murder." These documents are put out by an anti-vaccination society in Berkeley (home of learning and enlightenment) and the latter gives a list of doctors who indorse the anti-vaccination movement. The list is as follows: Dr. W. Allen, President of Board of Education, Berkeley; Dr. Farrar, Virginia street, Berkeley; Dr. Hitt, Adeline street, South Berkeley; Dr. J. N. Obery, Ellis street near Harmon, South Berkeley; Dr. W. H. Loomis, near Twenty-third on Twenty-ninth streets; East Oakland; Dr. Fahrman, Golden Gate; W. N. Griswold, M. D., 106 Eddy street, San Francisco; C. J. Holmgren, M. D., 1050 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco; Dr. A. D. Fouchy, 834 Santa Clara Avenue, Alameda; W. E. Ledyard, M. D., box 113, Alameda; R. Cauch, M. D., Carpenteria, Cal.; Blanche L. Sanborn, M. D., 1786 Sutter street, San Francisco; Dr. Nanie Clark, 722 West Seventh street, Los Angeles; Arthur C. Green, M. D., Broadway, Los Angeles; Matthew T. Wilson, M. D., 1666 Fell street, San Francisco; Edmund Beckwith, M. D., Petaluma; W. E. Ahernbaugh, M. D., Napa; Mrs. Dr. Moore, Berkeley; J. T. Tapley, Marysville, Yuba county; J. E. Huffman, M. D., 546 Sutter street, San Francisco; H. M. Bishop, M. D., 2627 Hoover street, Los Angeles; George Pyburn, M. D., 1011 H street, Sacramento; W. P. Chamberlain, M. D., Santa Cruz; Albert Hiller, M. D., 1019 Sutter street, San Francisco; W. P. Burke, M. D., Alauric, Sonoma county; and Dr. Franklin of Oakland, who brings the news